

# UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-8062

THE CITY OF  
**COLUMBUS**

ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF  
DEVELOPMENT

## MEETING SUMMARY

date

May 23, 2019

place

Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room

111 North Front Street, Room 204

time

present

Steven Papineau, Frank Petruziello, Kerry Reeds, Doreen Uhas Sauer, Keoni Fleming,

absent

Pasquale Grado, Kay Jones

A.

4:06

Business of the Board

1.

motion by

Motion

Vote

Approval of Meeting Summary from May 24, 2019

Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Reeds

To approve the meeting summary as submitted.

5-0

B.

Applications for Certificate of Approval

1.

address:

1993 Indianola Avenue

Single Family

app no.:

UID\_19-05-005

applicant:

Scott Solomon / Oxford Realty

reviewed:

Ext. Building Alterations

4:10 – 4:30

Recusal:

None

Staff Report:

Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.

Scott Solomon and David Hodge presented the proposal.

discussion:

- Mr. Fleming asked how old the addition was.
- Mr. Teba replied that it was probably from the 1920's or 30's.
- Mr. Fleming said he was ok with the proposal since it was for an addition, and not on the main house.
- Mr. Reed asked if they were changing the windows on the main house.
- Mr. Solomon said they were not.
- Mr. Petruziello asked what color the windows would be.
- Mr. Solomon said they would be white.
- Mr. Petruziello asked what the width was of the vinyl siding. Is it double four?
- Mr. Solomon said it came in several different products. He provided a brochure.
- Mr. Petruziello said it looked like double four and would want it to match the size of the existing siding on the lower level.
- Mr. Petruziello asked what the plans were for the rest of the house.
- Mr. Solomon replied that they were going to eventually repair the rest of the house.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that he wanted to be clear that if these improvements were approved, they would have no impact on future reviews. There would be a higher standard for the rest of the house.
- Ms. Sauer added that it is a beautiful house that used to be Dick Erikson's house. An old professor of chemistry whose car was rigged for dynamite when there was a war with developers over downzoning.
- Mr. Petruziello said he would not want the front porch to be covered in vinyl, the slate roof should be protected, and the box gutters maintained when they return for approval of work on the main structure. He asked if there would be muntins in the windows.
- Mr. Solomon said there would not be.

motion by

motion

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Fleming

To approve the proposal with the following conditions:

	<p>That all existing vinyl be removed before installation of new vinyl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the siding be sized to match the scale of the existing vinyl siding.</li> <li>• That the vinyl windows include no muntins or divided light panes.</li> <li>• That the approval of these materials will have no impact on future reviews to renovations of the main structure.</li> </ul>
vote	5-0
2. address	<b>2645 North High Street</b>
app no.:	<b>UID_19-05-006</b>
applicant:	Oliver Holtsberry / DaNite Sign
reviewed:	<b>Graphics</b>
<b>4:30 – 4:40</b>	
Recusal:	<b>None</b>
Staff report:	<p><b>Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Holtsberry presented the proposal.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said they would not approve a sign on the façade.</li> <li>• Mr. Holtsberry said they do not have a fall back plan. They are trying to direct customers to the business and are going to improve the High Street access door.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming asked what type of business it is.</li> <li>• Mr. Holtsberry said it is a coding school.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming suggested that the applicant should propose a sign associated with the door as opposed to on the second floor of the façade. That would further help direct customers to the business.</li> <li>• Mr. Reeds said it could possibly go above the door.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming said that it should go in the vicinity of the door.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said that the sign should be much smaller than what is being proposed. The Board doesn't really deal with second story businesses often.</li> <li>• Mr. Reeds asked what the guidelines stated about multiple blade signs.</li> <li>• Mr. Teba said that each business is supposed to be allowed one blade sign and one wall sign, but that is for ground floor tenants.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello asked where they could put a sign.</li> <li>• Mr. Teba replied that in speaking to Historic Preservation, they often recommend a blade sign near the door.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming said he could approve a blade sign with improvements to the door.</li> <li>• Mr. Kerry and Petruziello agreed.</li> <li>• Mr. Holtsberry stated that his client could be open to a blade sign.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said it couldn't be very big, something less than the height of the window.</li> <li>• Mr. Teba said the guidelines were 6sf per side.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said it could be slightly bigger on the second floor, but not much, maybe 10'x7". Are they going to make the door human, put a window in it? It isn't very welcoming.</li> <li>• Ms. Uhas said that she wasn't sure how a sign on the front of the building would help. There is no guarantee that front door will be used.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said that the door to High Street should be improved. The better the door looks, the more forgiving the Board can be with the signage. Maybe an awning would work.</li> </ul>
discussion:	
motion by	<b>The applicant requested that the proposal be tabled.</b>
Motion	
Vote	

3. address	1756-1758 North high Street	Verizon
app no.:	UID_19-04-001	
applicant:	Ryan Johnson	
reviewed:	Rooftop Antennas	
4:40 – 4:45		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	<p>Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.</p> <p>Mr. Jonson presented the proposal.</p>	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Petruziello asked if all the equipment on the Gamma and Beta sectors would be taken off the back of the parapet wall, put on a sled, and then the antennas would also be moved back.</li> <li>• Mr. Johnson said that was correct.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello asked Mr. Johnson to explain the Alpha sector.</li> <li>• Mr. Johnson said that the antennas would remain on the chimney, but the 5G antenna would be on a sled.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming said that the applicant had addressed the concerns raised at the last meeting.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello asked what color they would be.</li> <li>• Mr. Johnson said that they would be gray.</li> </ul>	
Motion by:	Mr. Fleming / Mr. Petruziello	
Motion	To approve the proposal as submitted	
Vote:	5-0	
4. address	90 West 9 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Multifamily
app no.:	UID_19-05-012	
applicant:	Bradley Blumensheid / Rhythm Architecture	
reviewed:	Ext. Building Alterations	
4:55 – 5:00		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	<p>Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.</p> <p>Mr. Blumensheid presented the proposal.</p>	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said he felt the style porch was incorrect for the aesthetic of the building. He asked why they were mixing double hung and casement. Why not use two casements instead of double hungs.</li> <li>• Mr. Blumensheid said he felt the double hungs on the south side addressed the street better.</li> <li>• Mr. Reeds asked if they could get the brick.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said they were Norman bricks, and it shouldn't be an issue.</li> <li>• Mr. Reeds said it would be very apparent where the doors and windows would be sealed.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming said he wanted to see a window in the kitchen, otherwise it would be too dark. Thirty-five foot deep units with windows on only one side. They could turn the doors into windows.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello asked Mr. Fleming for his opinion on the porch.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming said that the porch should be of the same language as the building. The building has a Dutch gable</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said the columns were the problem. Perhaps they could move in the columns, but then it would cover the door and window. If they kept the windows on the south façade the same size, they could push up the porch roof. That could help.</li> </ul>	
Motion by:	Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Petruziello	
Motion:	<p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All windows are to be casement style windows. The windows on the south façade should</li> </ul>	

Vote: 5-0

maintain their current dimensions and not be enlarged.

- The openings on the western façade can be closed, but casement style windows proportional in size to the larger second floor windows should be placed in the partially closed door openings.
- The porch is not part of the approval, and will have to return once revised.

**C. Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/ or Conceptual Review**

1. address	1542 North High Street	Store Front
app no.:	UID_19-05-011	
applicant:	David Keyser	
reviewed:	Ext. Building Alterations	
5:38– 6:00		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.</li> <li>• David Keyser presented the proposal.</li> </ul>	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Reeds asked why they needed the extra patio space. Was it just to animate the exterior alley area?</li> <li>• Mr. Keyser replied that was correct. The proposal will line up with the previously approved drink rail.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming asked if Campus Partners was ok with the alley being narrowed.</li> <li>• Mr. Keyser replied that they were.</li> <li>• Mr. Reeds said he had the same concerns about the alley being too narrow.</li> <li>• Mr. Keyser said the idea was that the additional activity would be a draw.</li> <li>• Mr. Fleming was concerned that the alley would become too narrow. He would like to see rendering that showing both sides of the alleyway.</li> <li>• Mr. Reeds said that if Campus Partners was ok with it then so was he.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said he felt the sheds were too chopped up. They looked a bit lean-to shed like. They look remodeled, and that may be due to the colors. Perhaps just the windows and doors are black. Additionally, he felt it wasn't clear where the front door was. The entrance should be more significant. The wrinkled metal perhaps shouldn't be put on the existing building.</li> <li>• Mr. Keyser said that it is currently siding.</li> <li>• Mr. Petruziello said that perhaps that should be storefront. The lean-to should be more cohesive and the entrance bigger. They will also need to see the signage to approve the overall plan.</li> <li>• Ms. Sauer said the lean-to looks too garden-shed like.</li> </ul>	
Motion by:	Conceptual Review	
Motion:		
Vote:		

**C. Public Forum**

1.	<b>Staff approval window list</b>
	Presentation by Carol Meyer (Pella)
reviewed:	<b>Vote on recommendation in support</b>
5:38– 6:00	
Recusals:	
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.</li> <li>• Carol Meyer presented the proposal.</li> </ul>
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Fleming stated that he felt the Lifestyle was a fairly modestly priced aluminum.</li> </ul>

- Ms. Meyer said that the biggest difference between the Architect Reserve and the Lifestyle is that the Reserve has butt jointed edge instead of a mitred edge and the Lifestyle is a bit thinner at the sill. The Architect Series Traditional is exactly the same as the reserve, except it has a mitred edge.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if she had an example of the vinyl window.
- Ms. Meyer showed the vinyl window the Board.
- Mr. Petruziello said the biggest issue was the non-typical screen mounting.
- Ms. Meyer agreed, and added that the difference between the 250 and 350 was the depth of frame.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if they made a vinyl window with a more traditional looking screen.
- Ms. Meyer said they did not. They are working on a fiberglass window that should look more like an aluminum clad on the outside.
- Mr. Petruziello asked what the options were for the muntin bars.
- Ms. Meyer said you could get it on one side, both sides, or in between.
- Mr. Fleming stated that while the Board is trying to improve the quality of the buildings in the district, they aren't trying to have as high a standard as the Historic Districts.
- Mr. Papineau said that they need to have a reasonably priced windows in order to allow property owners to improve the windows. If not, they will just leave the old drafty windows in the buildings.

Motion by:

Mr. Fleming / Ms. Uhas Sauer

Motion:

To approve the proposal with the following conditions:

Vote:

- To approve the Pella Lifestyle and Pella Architect style series windows.

4-0

E.	6:00	Staff Issued Certificates of Approval (March Items)		
			Items approved:	COA issued
1.		<b>31 East 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-05-001	Roof	<b>4/26/2019</b>
2.		<b>35 East 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-05-002	Roof	<b>4/26/2019</b>
3.		<b>1991 North 4<sup>th</sup> Street</b> UID_19-05-003	Roof	<b>5/6/2019</b>
4.		<b>65 West 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-05-004	Roof	<b>5/6/2019</b>
5.		<b>190 King Avenue</b> UID_19-05-008	Roof	<b>5/7/2019</b>
6.		<b>80 East 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-05-009	Roof	<b>5/7/2019</b>
7.		<b>190 West 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_18-12-009	Ext. Bldg. Alt. (Revised)	<b>5/7/2019</b>
8.		<b>1764 North High Street</b> UID_19-05-007	Ext. Building Alterations	<b>5/13/2019</b>
9.		<b>123 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street</b> UID_19-05-010	Exterior Repairs	<b>5/15/2019</b>
Motion:		Doreen Uhas Sauer / Petruziello		
Vote:		To approve the Staff Issued COA's		
		4-0		

<b>F.</b>	<b>6:03</b>	<b>Board Issued Applications Issued Certificates of Approval (February Items)</b>		
			<b>Items approved:</b>	<b>COA issued</b>
	<b>1.</b>	<b>28-32 East 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_18-11-010	<b>Preliminary Const. (WOSU)</b>	<b>4/23/2019</b>
	<b>2.</b>	<b>15 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-03-009	<b>Sign (Sweetwaters)</b>	<b>4/25/2019</b>
	<b>3.</b>	<b>112 East 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-04-007	<b>Variance Recommendation</b>	<b>4/26/2019</b>
	<b>4.</b>	<b>134 East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b> UID_19-04-006	<b>Ext. Building Alt. (Sorority)</b>	<b>4/30/2019</b>
	<b>5.</b>	<b>1976 North High Street</b> UID_19-04-004	<b>Temp. Ad. Mural</b>	<b>5/7/2019</b>
	<b>Motion:</b>	<b>To approve the Board Issued COA's</b>		
	<b>Vote:</b>	<b>4-0</b>		